

REMARKS

Claims 11-21 are pending. By this Response, claims 11 and 18 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunzman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,054,832) in view of Hewlett, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,303) and applicants admitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 11 and 18 each recite, *inter alia*, “an integrated value of a transmissivity in a visible range of said white-light transmitting filter is smaller than the combined integrated values of transmissivities in a visible range of said non-white transmitting filters”. As stated in the recited claim language, in the present invention, the white light does not over power the color filters. Thus, the transmissivity of brightness of the white light filter is smaller than the combined transmissivity of the colored filters  $C_r$ ,  $C_g$ ,  $C_b$ .

In contrast, Kunzman teaches the use of a color wheel that has two clear (white) regions that cover respectively 40 degrees and 20 degrees of the color wheel. See Fig. 4. The angle of these clear regions are specifically designed to allow for overall whitening purity or brightness of the entire display image to be maintained. Thus, Kunzman, et al. teaches away from the present invention. Kunzman teaches the use of the respective clear regions to increase the transmissivity or brightness of the white light in view of the non-white filters.

Also, Hewlett teaches the use of a filter having a red, green and blue filter region. Between each of these filter regions is a small neutral density filter (NDF) corresponding to one of the red, green or blue filters. The neutral density filter is a filter providing a reduced intensity of the main color filter to which it corresponds. Hewlett does not teach or suggest the use of white transmitting filters. Thus, Hewlett can not teach or suggest a transmissivity in a visible range of a white transmitting filter being smaller than the combined integrated values of transmissivities in a visible range of non-white transmitting filters, as recited in the presently claimed invention.

Finally, applicants admitted prior art also fails to teach the use of white transmitting filters. As illustrated in Fig. 2 and disclosed on page 7 of the specification, each of the filters are color filters. This filter is similar to Hewlett's filter in which the main color filters red, green and blue are separated by smaller segments of filters which correspond to one of the main color filters. The smaller segment filters have a lower transmissivity of color from those of the main filters. Applicants note that the last paragraph on page 7 specifically indicates that each of the filters in Fig. 2 are color filters.

In view of the above, the combination of Kunzman, Hewlett and applicant's admitted prior art fail to teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Specifically, the combined teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an integrated value of a transmissivity in a visible range of said white transmitting filters smaller than the combined integrated values of transmissivities in a visible

range of said non-white transmitting filters, as recited in independent claims 11 and 18. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-21 are distinguishable over the cited references. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 09/887,665

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

<sup>cc</sup>  
MRC/CJB:cb  
0925-0184P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000